

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

## 12

13  
14  
15  
16

17  
18  
19  
20

22

23

24

1 teach or suggest displaying a live television broadcast via the primary display  
2 screen through a Web browser program, as recited in claim 1.

3 The Office recognizes that Duffield does not disclose displaying video  
4 through a Web browser program (*Office Action* p.3). Duffield only describes a  
5 television for multiple picture display of television channels. There is no  
6 indication of a Web browser program in Duffield, nor is there even a suggestion of  
7 a computing device or system that would possibly support the implementation of a  
8 Web browser program in Duffield.

9 LeGall describes a “user’s world” as a scratch pad which is an HTML  
10 frame generated based upon resources selected by a user. The display space can  
11 include an audio and video window for the displaying of audio/video broadcasts  
12 acquired from regular broadcast cable or satellite transmissions (*LeGall*  
13 *Summary*). As shown in LeGall Fig. 5, a scratch pad (515) can include a Web  
14 browser (530) as an Internet resource (520) and/or can include an audio/video  
15 window (540) (not identified in Fig. 5; shown only as “A/V”) from a broadcast  
16 source “A/V” (*LeGall* col.5, line 62 to col.6, line 1).

17 Although LeGall describes that a selection from a broadcast source can be  
18 viewed in an audio/video window that is separate from a Web browser, LeGall  
19 does not teach or suggest displaying a live television broadcast via the primary  
20 display screen through a Web browser program, as recited in claim 1.

21 The Office cites to LeGall at col.2, lines 25-29 for video or broadcast  
22 resources, and cites to col.6, lines 1-4 which describes that the audio/video  
23 window (540) on the scratch pad (515) in Fig. 5 supports “enhanced programming,  
24 such as in web pages with live audio and video”. However, neither section of  
25

1 LeGall describes displaying a live television broadcast through a Web browser  
2 program, as recited in claim 1.

3 The Office also cites to LeGall at col.7, lines 17-28 with reference to  
4 Fig. 7c for an example of an audio/video display window (720), and cites to col.8,  
5 lines 3-8 which describes that the "user's world" is represented by an HTML  
6 frame, and that a Web browser can be used to view Web sites that are part of the  
7 user's world. For example, a Web site (535) can be viewed with the HTML  
8 browser (530) as shown in Fig. 5. Again, neither of these sections of LeGall  
9 describes displaying a live television broadcast through a Web browser program,  
10 as recited in claim 1.

11 Further, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office that it would have  
12 been obvious to modify the system of Duffield by presenting a live television  
13 broadcast through a Web browser as described by DeGall (*Office Action* p.3).  
14 There is no indication of a Web browser program in Duffield, nor is there even a  
15 suggestion of a computing device or system that would possibly support the  
16 implementation of a Web browser program in Duffield. Further, there is no  
17 indication in DeGall of displaying a live television broadcast through a Web  
18 browser program. As such, there is no motivation to combine DeGall with  
19 Duffield.

20 Accordingly, claim 1 along with dependent claims 2-5 and 7-19 are  
21 allowable over the Duffield-DeGall combination and Applicant respectfully  
22 requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

23  
24 **Claim 8** recites "enlarging the active small display screen to full-screen  
25 mode and removing the remaining small display screens". The Office recognizes

1 that “Duffield does not disclose removing the remaining secondary video  
2 pictures”, and takes Official Notice that the recited feature(s) are well known  
3 (*Office Action* pp.3-4).

4 Applicant respectfully disagrees, because the allegedly well known facts  
5 are not capable of “instant and unquestionable demonstration,” as required to  
6 make a rejection based on Official Notice (*see* MPEP § 2144.03(A)). As the  
7 Examiner is likely aware, Applicant is required to challenge statements that are  
8 not supported on the record, and failure to do so will be construed as an admission  
9 by the Applicant that the statement is true (M.P.E.P. §2144.03). Therefore, the  
10 Examiner is requested to cite a reference supporting the position that it would have  
11 been obvious for “enlarging the active small display screen to full-screen mode  
12 and removing the remaining small display screens”, as recited in claim 8. If the  
13 Examiner is unable to provide such a reference, and is relying on facts based on  
14 personal knowledge, Applicant hereby requests that such facts be set forth in an  
15 affidavit from the Examiner under 37 C.F.R. 1.104(d)(2). Absent substantiation, it  
16 is respectfully requested that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

17  
18 Independent **Claims 20, 26, and 33-35** recite a similar feature of displaying  
19 a live television broadcast via the primary display screen through a web browser  
20 program. For at least the reasons described above in the response to the rejection  
21 of claim 1, independent claims 20, 26, and 33-35 are allowable over the  
22 Duffield-DeGall combination and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103  
23 rejection be withdrawn.

24 In addition, claims 21-25 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon  
25 claim 20 (either directly or indirectly), and claims 27-28 are allowable by virtue of

1 their dependency upon claim 26. Similar to claim 8, Applicant also requests the  
2 Examiner to cite a reference supporting the position that it would have been  
3 obvious for “enlarging the active small display screen to full-screen mode and  
4 removing the remaining small display screens”, as recited in claim 21.

5  
6 **Claim 29** recites that the primary display screen comprises a live television  
7 broadcast displayed through an interactive display environment including World  
8 Wide Web content. Duffield and/or DeGall do not teach or suggest a live  
9 television broadcast displayed through an interactive display environment  
10 including World Wide Web content, as recited in claim 29. Further, for at least  
11 the reasons described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, claim 29  
12 along with dependent claims 31-32 are allowable over the Duffield-DeGall  
13 combination and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be  
14 withdrawn.

15  
16 **Claim 36** recites the primary display screen capable of displaying a live  
17 television broadcast through a web browser program. For at least the reasons  
18 described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, claim 36 is allowable  
19 over the Duffield-DeGall combination. Claim 36 is also allowable over the  
20 Boyer-Duffield-DeGall combination because Boyer does not address the  
21 deficiencies of either Duffield or DeGall as described above in the response to the  
22 rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

23  
24  
25

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

8

10

10

10  
11  
12